1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 GEORGIA-PACIFIC CONSUMER Civil No. 07-cv-2391-JAH (POR) PRODUCTS LP, a Delaware limited 11 partnership, 12 Plaintiff. ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S EX PARTE APPLICATION FOR 13 EXPEDITED DISCOVERY LEE'S GENERAL TOYS, INC., a California 14 [Doc. No. 24] corporation; JOHN LEE, an individual; DOES 1-100, 15 Defendant. 16 17 On February 1, 2008, Plaintiff filed an exparte application to expedite discovery in this 18 matter. Plaintiff requests limited expedited discovery to obtain evidence in support of its application 19 for preliminary injunctive relief. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks: (1) documents containing the names 20 of, and contact information for, Defendants' sources and distributors dating back to the first sale; (2) 21 Defendants' sales and financial records pertaining to products bearing the infringing marks dating 22 back to the first sale; and (3) Defendants' records concerning prosecution of state or federal 23 trademarks for "Angelite" or confusingly similar marks. To obtain this information, Plaintiff 24 proposes to serve a narrowly-tailored set of requests for production of documents and to take the 25 deposition of Defendant John Lee, noticed for February 11, 2008. 26

On February 4, 2008, Defendants filed an opposition to Plaintiff's ex parte application.

Defendants argue that Plaintiff's ex parte application should be denied as they have provided Plaintiff with the information it seeks to the extent the request is not overbroad and oppressive, and

27

28

- 1 - 07cv2391

Defendants intend to continue cooperating with Plaintiff.

By court order or agreement of the parties, parties may conduct discovery prior to the meet and confer requirement prescribed by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f). Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(d). A party seeking expedited discovery must demonstrate "good cause" for the early discovery. Semitool, Inc. v. Tokyo Electron America, 208 F.R.D. 273 (N.D. Cal. 2002); Yokohama Tire Corp. v. Dealers Tire Supply, Inc., 202 F.R.D. 612, 614 (D. Ariz. 2001). "Good cause may be found where the need for expedited discovery, in consideration of the administration of justice, outweighs the prejudice to the responding party." Semitool, 208 F.R.D. at 276.

Here, Plaintiff fails to demonstrate good cause for expedited discovery. The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's requests and it appears the information Plaintiff seeks goes to the issue of potential damages, and therefore, is not limited to demonstrating irreparable harm, which is the standard for seeking injunctive relief. Defendants have cooperated with Plaintiff and have taken steps to avoid further injury to Plaintiff by destroying the outer wrappings of its entire inventory of "Angelite" bathroom tissues, ensuring that there are no further orders of these products from China, and providing Plaintiff with the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of Defendants' manufacturer and agent in China and the names and addresses of Defendants' distributors and retailers. (Exhibits A and B of Defendants' Opposition to Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application.) Any further information in addition to what Defendants have provided thus far would appear beyond the scope of what is necessary to establish a basis for injunctive relief. See Weinberger v. Romero-Barcelo, 456 U.S. 305, 312 (1982) ("The basis for injunctive relief (preliminary or permanent) in the federal courts has always been *irreparable injury* and the *inadequacy of legal remedies*."). Plaintiff provides nothing more than mere speculation that the information provided by Defendants is a misrepresentation. Accordingly, good cause does not exist to grant Plaintiff with immediate access

25 ///

///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

- 2 - 07cv2391

to the requested discovery, and thus, Plaintiff's ex parte application for expedited discovery is hereby DENIED. IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: February 8, 2008 LOUISA S PORTER United States Magistrate Judge The Honorable John A. Houston cc: all parties